

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-22 remain in the application.

The allowance of claims 3, 10 and 15 subject to being rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims is noted with appreciation.

Claims 1, 4-6 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Passafiume (U.S. Patent 6,119,303). Admittedly, Passafiume discloses a paint roller grid 10 including a wiping surface 14 and a pair of laterally spaced hooks 45, 46 extending rearwardly from the grid for hooking over the upper rim of a container. Also each of the hooks 45, 46 of Passafiume includes a rearwardly extending upper portion 50, 52 and a downwardly extending intumed lip. However, as shown in Figs. 1 and 2 and described in column 4, lines 36-39 of Passafiume, the inwardly bent distal tips 47, 48 of the hooked end portions 45, 46 of Passafiume are J-shaped to hook under an outwardly extending collar 96 adjacent the upper rim of the container 90, not intumed lips having a forwardly facing, laterally inwardly angled surface for engaging an outer cylindrical surface of the container below the container rim as recited in claims 1 and 18. Accordingly, claims 1 and 18 are submitted as clearly allowable.

Claims 4-6 depend from claim 1 and are also submitted as clearly allowable.

Claims 12-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Welt (U.S. Patent 3,394,425). However, Welt discloses a wiping surface 12 of expanded metal having side bars 20, 22 rotatably connected along opposing edges of the wiping surface, with each side bar having a hook 32, 34 at one end for hooking over an upper end of a cylindrical container and a foot 24, 26 at the other end, not a frame

extending completely around the wiping surface having at least one hook extending rearwardly from the frame for hooking over the upper rim of a cylindrical container, and a pair of laterally spaced feet extending rearwardly from a bottom edge of the frame for engagement with an inner cylindrical surface of the container as recited in claim 12. Accordingly, claim 12 is submitted as clearly allowable.

Claims 13, 14 and 16 depend from claim 12 and further patentably distinguish over Welt, claims 13 and 14 by reciting that the feet are rigidly affixed to the bottom edge of the frame and extend rearwardly at a slight outward angle relative to respective side edges of the frame and have outwardly facing outer ends that engage the inner cylindrical surface of the container, and claim 16 by reciting a pair of hooks extending rearwardly from opposite side edges of the frame in spaced relation from a bottom edge of the frame a distance slightly greater than the height of the container. In contrast, the feet 24, 26 and hooks 32, 34 of Welt are at opposite ends of side bars 20, 22 rotatably connected along opposing edges of the expanded metal sheet 12. Also claim 14 additionally recites that the outer ends of the respective feet are angled rearwardly and inwardly for making contact with the inner cylindrical surface of the container.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Passafiume in view of McManaway (U.S. Patent 4,083,466). According to the Examiner, it would have been obvious to have modified the hooks of Passafiume so that they extend laterally outward from side edges of a grid depending on the desired location of the grid relative to the inside of the container. However, it is respectfully submitted that to angle the hooks of Passafiume so that they extend laterally outward from opposite side edges of the grid would be directly contrary to the teachings of

Passafiume which discloses that the inwardly bent distal tips 47, 48 of the hooked end portions 45, 46 are J-shaped to hook under the upper rim 94 of the container 90.

Moreover, claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is further submitted as allowable for substantially the same reasons.

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Passafiume in view of Welt. The Examiner acknowledges that Passafiume fails to disclose a pair of rearwardly extending and laterally spaced feet for engaging an inner surface of the container, but contends that it would have been obvious to have modified the lower angled portions 54, 56 of the L-shaped channels 20, 22 of Passafiume to include a pair of spaced feet 24, 26 as taught by Welt which serve the same purpose. However, the feet 24, 26 of Welt are at one end of the side bars 24, 26 which are rotatably connected along opposing edges of the sheet 12 of expanded metal, not a pair of laterally spaced feet extending rearwardly from a bottom edge of the grid for substantial flat engagement with the inside bottom surface of the container and with an inner cylindrical surface of the container as recited in claims 7-9. Accordingly, claims 7-9 are further submitted as allowable in their own right in addition to being ultimately dependent on claim 1.

Claims 11, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Passafiume in view of Morgan, Sr. (U.S. Patent 4,145,789). According to the Examiner, Passafiume discloses the invention substantially as claimed with the exception of a portion of the grid extending above the upper rim of the container. For this feature, the Examiner relies on Morgan, contending that it would have been obvious to have modified the grid of Passafiume so that an implement such

as a paint roller could be easily hooked onto an upper edge of the grid as shown in Fig. 1 of Morgan. However, claim 11 depends from claim 1 and claims 20 and 22 depend from claim 18 and are submitted as allowable for substantially the same reasons. Moreover, in neither Passafiume nor Morgan does the wiping surface include an apertured portion that extends axially outwardly beyond the hooks as recited in claims 11 and 22. Accordingly, claims 11 and 22 are further submitted as allowable in their own right in addition to being dependent on claims 1 and 18, respectively.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Passafiume and Morgan, Sr. and further in view of Welt. However, claim 21 ultimately depends from claim 18 and further patentably distinguishes over the cited references by reciting a frame extending completely around the wiping surface and a pair of laterally spaced feet extending rearwardly from a bottom edge of the frame in substantial flat engagement with the inside bottom surface of the container and with an inner cylindrical surface of the container.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Welt in view of Morgan, Sr. However, neither of these references discloses a wiping surface having an apertured portion that extends axially outwardly beyond the hooks as recited in claim 17. Accordingly, claim 17 is submitted as allowable in its own right in addition to being dependent on claim 16.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Passafiume in view of Linn et al (U.S. Patent 5,283,928). According to the Examiner, it would have been obvious to have modified the device of Passafiume to include flexible hooks as taught by Linn. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has

combined these references in light of applicant's teachings and certainly not from any teachings or suggestions found in the cited references, which is clearly improper. Accordingly, claim 19 is submitted as allowable in its own right in addition to being dependent on claim 18.

For the foregoing reasons, this application is now believed to be in condition for final allowance of all of the pending claims 1-22, and early action to that end is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner disagree with applicant's attorney in any respect, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney in an effort to resolve such differences.

In the event that an extension of time is necessary, this should be considered a petition for such an extension. If required, fees are enclosed for the extension of time and/or for the presentation of new and/or amended claims. In the event any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this reply, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 18-0988 (Attorney Docket No. WOOSP0131US).

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By 
Donald L. Otto
Registration No. 22,125

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-2191
Phone: 216-621-1113
Fax: 216-621-6165

Z:\SEC177\WOOSTER\IP131US\REPLY TO OA OF 10-18-04.wpd